

**NOTE: This manuscript is under review, please do not distribute.**

Towards Academic Gender Justice: Trans\* Faculty Re-conceptualizing Gender Equity

Erich N. Pitcher

Michigan State University

**ABSTRACT:** Despite debate about the status of women faculty within U.S. universities, the discourse of gender equity often follows genderist and heterosexist logics (e.g., only two genders, oriented along heterosexual lines). In this qualitative study, I draw on the perspectives of trans\* faculty to explore the ways that participants re-conceptualized gender equity, in what I call *academic gender justice*. Participants indicated that collecting data about trans\* people is critically important, but there are potential challenges with this approach. Participants also indicated that unsettling existing logics of the family and expanding understanding about the unique forms of oppression that face trans\* faculty are important in re-conceptualizing gender equity. Taken together, I bring participant's disparate perspectives together under the concept of *academic gender justice*. In so doing, I argue that an intersectional approach to addressing gender-based oppression is an important mechanism to reduce the negative effects of such oppression.

**KEYWORDS:** transgender, academic profession, faculty, gender equity, higher education, academic gender justice

**ABSTRACT WC:** 146

Despite rigorous debate about, and sluggish action to improve the status of women faculty within U.S. colleges and universities, the discourse of gender equity often follows logics, or material practices and symbolic constructions (Friendland & Alford, 1991), of genderism (Bilodeau, 2009) and heterosexism (Sears, 1997; Herek, 1990). The Association of American University Professor's (AAUP) 2006 report "AAUP Faculty Gender Equity Indicators" is no exception (West & Curtis, 2006). By using metrics like employment status for men and women and analyzing pay differences between them, West and Curtis' (2006) report reifies the gender binary, instantiating two and only two possible genders. In other words, the report follows a logic of genderism (Bilodeau, 2009). Despite being called a gender equity report, it and much of the scholarship concerned with gender equity, focuses on certain genders, namely cisgender<sup>1</sup> men and women. Phrases like "gender balance" imply that there are two genders that can come into balance (West & Curtis, 2006, p. 14). What is more, the word transgender does not even appear in AAUP's report on gender equity.

An additional logic undergirding gender equity work is presumed heterosexuality. In a call out box in the AAUP 2006 Report, the authors write, "The academy must make further efforts to convey to women that they no longer need to make a choice between raising children and becoming tenure-track faculty members" (p. 14). While I fully agree with the sentiments that academic workplaces must be spaces where all kinds of women can flourish as scholars, the underlying assumption is that women will shoulder child-rearing responsibilities. That is certainly a reasonable assumption given the division of labor in most households in the U.S. A statement issued by AAUP regarding "Principles on Family Responsibilities and Academic Work" stated that "The conflict between work and family obligations that many faculty members experience is more acute for women faculty than for men" (AAUP, 2001, p. 339-340). The statement then goes on to say that "only women give birth" and that "87% of women become parents during their

---

<sup>1</sup> Cisgender refers to a person whose assigned sex aligns with their current gender identity (Enke, 2011).

working lives” (p. 340). I am not debating that a majority of women have children, or that academic workplaces should increase their flexibility to support individuals with families. Rather I am arguing that the statement on family responsibilities does not adequately address the lives of lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans\*, and queer individuals. In particular, statements such as the ones referenced above elide the experiences of trans\*<sup>2</sup> parents, queer parents, single parents, and a host of other individuals who operate outside of the cisgender-heterosexual-patriarchal view of families. I am left to conclude that despite the debate about gender equity, in which issues of parenting are deeply embedded, trans\* faculty are left out of the discussion.

In this article, I seek to raise the voices of trans\* faculty, in order to advance the conversation about gender equity as a way to move beyond conceiving of women as exclusively cisgender, and mostly heterosexual, and presumably childbearing. It is reasonable to read the current conceptualization of gender equity as built on interlocking systems of oppression, first, genderism, or the belief that there are two and only two genders (Bilodeau, 2009); and heterosexism, “evidenced in the exclusion, omission or design, of non-heterosexual persons in policies, procedures, events, or activities” (Sears, 1997, p. 16). This is especially the case given that straight, cisgender lives are often the target of interventions of gender equity policies. This is not to diminish the important work of gender equity scholars, but rather to suggest that conceptualizing gender equity more broadly, and inclusively, could enhance the lived experiences of those adversely affected by gender-based oppression within academe, but especially trans\* faculty. I seek to elevate issues facing trans\* faculty who may or may not identify within the gender binary and/or as heterosexual.

The current pressures of academic life (e.g., publish or perish), coupled with identities that are unfamiliar to many within the academy, and society more broadly, make the study of trans\* faculty experiences a timely and relevant topic for higher education research. Yet, few

---

<sup>2</sup> Trans\* or transgender are used interchangeably throughout this paper. Trans\* is used to express the broadest possible array of gender diverse identities (Enke, 2011) and is used to “open up” trans for a “greater range of meanings” (Thompkins, 2012, p. 26).

empirical articles address the experiences of gender diverse faculty. Given the noted gap in the literature about trans\* faculty experiences (Renn, 2010), conducting research with this population is important for at least three reasons.

First, given the vast amounts of human capital held by faculty, even if such a conceptualization follows neoliberal logics, means that the educational investments in trans\* scholars are worth noting. Secondly, I contend that trans\* individuals bring a unique perspective and enhance the diversity of the educational organizations of which they are a part. In addition, the embodied knowledge that trans\* individuals hold is valuable. For instance, Joy, a transsexual woman in this study said, “I have learned an awful lot from being a trans person in academia. It has transformed my understanding of just about everything.” Thirdly, given the erasure and marginalization of trans\* experiences (e.g., through knowledge production, social institutions, Namaste, 2000), providing avenues for trans\* faculty to exercise agency and voice is important from a social justice perspective.

### **Literature Review**

Gender equity scholarship is quite robust, dating back to the mid-1970s (e.g., Johnson & Stafford, 1974; Kilson, 1976) with many disciplines and fields (e.g., Education, Law, Medicine) weighing in on key questions related to gender within the academy. The literature in this area takes qualitative (e.g., Armenti, 2004, Cress & Hart, 2004) and quantitative approaches (e.g., Nettles & Perna, 1995; Toutkoushian & Conley, 2005; Umbach, 2007). Scholars work with a variety of theoretical approaches, including feminist (e.g., Bird, Litt, & Wang, 2004; Lester, 2011) and sociological (Gibson, 2006), among others.

One of the initial goals of gender equity work was to disaggregate salary data by “gender,” though most scholars and laypersons alike conflate sex (referring to biological characteristics and the assumptions that there are two sexes that correspond neatly with gender, Enke, 2011) and gender (referring to cultural practices that organize individuals based on presumed sex, Enke, 2011). By conflating sex with gender, trans\* lives are invisible within

existing literature addressing gender equity. The current ways that institutions collect data about sex/gender makes faculty either male or female, a genderist practice (Bilodeau, 2009).

There are many potential metrics of gender equity, but common indicators include: equal pay for males and females (e.g., Umbach, 2007) and employment status (Cress & Hart, 2009). West and Curtis (2006) examined four indicators of gender equity: employment status, tenure status, full professor rank, and average salary. Findings indicate that across the four indicators developed by West and Curtis (2006) that the status of women is not equal to that of men. In terms of U.S. national trends, women constitute less than half of all full time faculty positions, despite out pacing men in educational attainment (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; King, 2006; West & Curtis, 2006). While the overall numbers of tenure track faculty positions decreased, women are over-represented in non-tenure track faculty roles and under-represented within full professorships (West & Curtis, 2006). Also, women faculty tend to earn less money than men, approximately 81 cents on the man's dollar, across ranks and institutional types (West & Curtis, 2006).

Despite four decades of research in this area, gender inequities persist. Probert (2005) argued that there are two frameworks commonly used to understand the persistence of gender inequities. The first framework holds that unequal treatment of men and women within academic workplaces leads to inequities and inequalities. The second framework focuses on women and men having different levels of capital, with men and women's different choices leading to inequities. Neither perspective is particularly compelling given that Umbach (2007) provided solid evidence that even if there are differences in individual choices and academic disciplines, pay inequities remain. Thus, Umbach (2007) dispelled the notion that capital and choices influence these differences.

While there is growing body of research that indicates that women with children suffer discrimination within academe (e.g., Mason & Goulden, 2004; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004), conceptualizing narrow vectors of oppression (e.g., women with children) does little to expand

the underlying logics that support systems of domination. I contend, as Probert (2005) did, that the single largest problem with the perspective that posits that inequities and inequalities exist between men and women result from some inherent difference follows “essentialist and dichotomized view[s] of male and female difference” (Probert, 2005, p. 53). This view of sex/gender relations does little to disrupt dominant understandings of the systems of oppression that intersect within the academy and lead to unequal employment outcomes and experiences. Rather than continue to advance existing logics of genderism and heterosexism, as I will argue, there is a need to re-think conceptualizations of gender equity.

### **Theoretical Perspectives**

This research employed Spade’s (2011) concept of Critical Trans Politics (CTP) as a way to theorize and make sense of trans\* academics’ perspectives about gender equity. For the purposes of this paper, I used Spade’s (2011) definition of CTP as “a trans politics that demands more than legal recognition and inclusion, seeking instead to transform current logics of state, civil society security, and social equality” (p. 19). This perspective is built on three primary assumptions. First, trans\* faculty operate within a neoliberal context, or an environment rooted in increased privatization and entrepreneurial activities within higher education (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Second, this perspective encourages resistance of an individual rights framework, which often follows neoliberal logics of progress and remediation, as solutions to discrimination (Spade, 2011). Based on this perspective, I do not conceive of potential solutions to trans\* faculty members’ negative workplace experiences as being easily remedied by non-discrimination policies and/or domestic partner benefits. Finally, this perspective encourages resistance to neoliberalism and mainstream approaches to LGBTQ rights focused on equality and instead pushes for resistance of dominant norms and discourses about gender (Spade, 2011). Often scholars equate equity (e.g., being fair) with equality (e.g., being of equal status) (Bailyn, 2003).

For the purposes of this paper, I am interested more in gender justice as a potential way to shift current thinking about gender inequalities and inequities. Gender justice builds on the ideas of Young (2011) who argued that the primary aim of a relational approach to social justice is to eliminate institutionalize forms of oppression and domination. Young (2011) defined oppression as “systematic institutional processes which prevent some people from learning and using satisfying and expansive skills in socially recognized settings” (p. 38) and domination as “institutional conditions which inhibit or prevent people from participating in determining their actions and the conditions of their actions”(p. 38). Extending this work, gender-based oppression consists of institutional processes that prevent the full realization of individuals’ capacities and gender-based domination is the institutional conditions that prevent individuals from determining their own action (Young, 2011). Gender justice must be intersectional (Crenshaw, 1989; 1991), as all oppression is interconnected (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012).

In this study, I place individual trans\* faculty voices together to complicate, and speak back to each other’s preferred solutions. In so doing, I seek to create a more nuanced understanding of what gender justice work might look like from the vantage points of participants. In keeping with the notion of gender justice as intersectional, previous work about gender equity doesn’t always center experiences of racialization. Yet, when taken together racial, ethnic, and gender differences often manifest in further pay inequalities. For example, Toutkoushian, Bellas, and Moore (2007) found that gender, race, ethnicity, and marital status all influence faculty salaries. Females/women are paid less and being married or cohabiting increases pay and white married/cohabiting men continue to have a salary advantage (Toutkoushain et al., 2007). Findings such as these, point to the importance of considering multiple vectors of oppression that affect faculty lives, as simply looking at gender is no longer adequate.

Here, I describe a new approach to understanding gender equity within academic workplaces. Specifically, I describe the notion of *academic gender justice*. Here I provide some cursory tenets, crystallized by participants’ narratives and experiences, and undergirded by the

theoretical perspectives articulated above. By way of explanation, I came to *academic gender justice* via thinking through gender equity with participants. As I describe in more detail in subsequent paragraphs, part of the difficulty of re-thinking gender equity inclusive of trans\* faculty is that gender equity never meant to include more than two genders and/or non-cisgender identities. Gender equity, albeit inadvertently in some cases, rests on a binary notion of gender, as most indicators of equity make comparisons between women and men (e.g., Curtis & West, 2006). In short, gender equity hinges on a two-box model of gender.

In contrast, *academic gender justice* emphasizes the following tenets:

- Conceptualizing gender as multifaceted with men and women, being but two options, with corresponding data systems and forms which make explicit the existence of trans\* people
- Importance of understanding social identities as mutually constitutive of gender identities, including but not limited to race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, and ability, and the multiply marginalized that occurs among individuals who occupy multiply minoritized subject positions (Nordmaken, 2014)
- Centrality of trans\* individuals in naming the conditions of their oppression and developing a course of action in response
- Salience of the heterosexual matrix<sup>3</sup> (Butler, 1990) and heterosexism (Sear, 1997), cissexism<sup>4</sup> (Serano, 2007), and/or cisgenderism<sup>5</sup> (Lennon & Mistler, 2012; Serano, 2007) within trans\* faculty experiences

---

<sup>3</sup> Heterosexual matrix is the system of dominance that is built on male, white, heterosexual superiority (Butler, 1990).

<sup>4</sup> Cissexism is the assumption that transsexual gender identities and sex embodiments are less legitimate than cissexual ones (Serano, 2007).

<sup>5</sup> Cisgenderism is the “cultural and systemic ideology that denies, denigrates, or pathologizes self-identified gender identities that do not align with assigned gender at birth as well as resulting behavior, expression, and community” (Lennon & Mistler, 2012, p. 63)

- Strategies of contesting norms and rethinking existing logics of gender (among other social identities) are necessary to improve the livability of trans\* faculty lives (Spade, 2011)

### **Methodology**

I report a portion of the findings from a larger qualitative study that used narrative inquiry, or an exploration of the human experience, with a focus on the stories of participants (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Narrative inquiry allowed the stories of these participants to be told in meaningful ways and to create opportunities for trans\* individuals to tell their stories on their own terms. Given the historical erasure, exclusion, and discounting of trans\* perspectives, I intentionally constructed a dynamic with participants built on authenticity and integrity. Specifically, I engaged in an ethic of care with participants' narratives, challenged my own assumptions about participants' ways of being, and affirmed that participants are partners in this research. This is demonstrated in receiving approval from participants in the accurate representation of their experiences in writing.

This study responds to the following research question: How, and in what ways, do trans\* faculty re-conceptualize the discourse of gender equity in light of their lived experiences? Specifically, I analyze participants' responses to an interview question about gender equity. The question was: gender equity is an important issue for colleges and universities. Sometimes gender equity discussions focus on issues like pay equity, family-leave policy, and so on. How might gender equity conversations within the academy shift, if at all, if trans\* voices were included? Within this portion of the interviews, participants relied less on their own stories and experiences directly and instead imagined a possible future context that took their stories into account. In asking participants to imagine what the inclusion of trans\* voices within the discourse of gender equity, participants often responded with uncertainty. I explore this more in the findings.

In order to analyze the data, I examined each participant's transcripts for their responses to the above question. I analyzed this data at the level of "discourse" to understand the false starts, stops, silences, and laughter. The discursive analytic approach yielded uncertainties about what it would mean to include trans\* voices within gender equity. Then I examined the responses to the question from a "pragmatic perspective," asking of the data, what it would mean to practically shift from current understandings of gender equity to possible future conceptualizations. Finally, I examined responses from a conceptual perspective, asking what conceptual and rhetorical moves would re-conceptualizing gender equity require. These three readings lead to drawing out different aspects of trans\* faculty's perspectives about re-conceptualizing gender equity, described more below.

### **Participants**

Participants were identified via a list-serve and Facebook group for trans\*academics. All potential participants ( $n=34$ ) completed a brief interest survey. The survey collected demographics, educational background information, and details about institutional affiliation, including length of time in one's current position and the type of faculty appointment. Among the interested participants, I purposefully sampled ten U.S. based participants to include a variety of gender identities backgrounds, institutional types, and sexual orientations. Despite purposeful sampling, the majority of participants are white, queer, trans\*masculine spectrum individuals from the social sciences or humanities. Participants are currently employed at a range of institutional types, including public research universities, community colleges, proprietary institutions, religiously affiliated universities, and regional public universities. There is a geographic range with Midwestern, Southern, Eastern, and Western states represented (see chart 1.0).

Insert chart 1.0 about here

### **Data Sources**

A majority of participants completed one digitally recorded interview lasting between 90 and 360 minutes and responded to a narrative prompt that focused on compliance and resistance to gender and academic norms before the interview. One participant engaged in three interviews, lasting 120 minutes each, multiple interviews were largely due to scheduling issues. Interviews focused on developing an understanding of how trans\* faculty conceptualize their identities and then their scholarly lives, discussing their research, teaching, and service responsibilities. In order to allow participants to craft and control their narratives throughout the process, and to ensure the accuracy and validity of the data, I used member checking (Creswell, 2009).

The Institutional Review Board determined this research to be exempt and this research follows all standards set forth by the institutional review board (IRB). I negotiated confidentiality with each of the participants. Some participants wanted to be less identifiable (used a pseudonym, changed discipline), while others required less confidentiality (opted not to use a pseudonym). I stored interview files by pseudonym/name and no identifying information appeared on the transcripts or narrative responses.

### **Reflexivity**

As Saumure and Given (2008) note the foundation of rigorous qualitative research involves reflexivity. In this section, I am accounting for the ways that I ultimately influenced the research process and the conclusions made about the data. The conclusions I made about the data are ultimately influence by my subject position, the power relations within each of the interviews, and my worldview. There are three aspects of my subjectivity that seemed to play a role in this study: age, graduate student status, and gender identity. I describe each below.

My age influenced the research process as some participants described their earliest experiences with gender non-conformity beginning in the early 1980s, around the time I was born. Additionally, my status as a graduate student served as an important point of connection between us, as each of them were at some point graduate students as well. Participants often expressed resonance with the difficulty of being a graduate student. For example, Bryce said that

they liked that I signed my recruitment email “In Struggle” with the double meaning of in struggle in a social justice sense and the graduate student struggle sense.

My status as a trans\* person, particularly a white trans\* person, influenced who participated in this study. Of the 34 potential participants, all but three were similarly identified to myself, more specifically, white trans\* people who were female assigned at birth. Participants were aware of my identity as a trans\* person, as many of them reported that they “Googled” me prior to our interviews to “know what [or who] they were getting” as Jake put it. Jake stated that his answers might be different if I was cisgender. Jake also mentioned that throughout the interview he left some things unsaid as he assumed I knew what he meant and that he did not need to explain himself, as he might with a non-trans\* person.

### **Study Boundaries**

Rather than describe limitations of this research, I articulate the study’s boundaries. The narratives, I share here are critically important in expanding understandings about *academic gender justice*. However, the vast majority of participants identify racially as white, some ethnically as Jewish. One participant identified as Black. Additionally, the majority of participants hold masculine of center trans\* identities. Systemic racism and genderism, exclude trans\* people of color from higher education, and a variety of other social institutions, thus bounding this study by the larger institutional norms in which this project operated. The devaluing of trans\* women, white and of color, both within society, and within higher education means this project does not include as many voices from feminine of center trans\* individuals. Despite the absence of racially diverse participants, I speak to issues of race through the silences within individual’s experiences.

### **Re-Conceptualizing Gender Equity with Trans\* Faculty**

I think through three areas of participants’ responses. First, I describe the uncertainty with which participants answered this question, thinking through silence and laughter. Then, I describe the theoretical re-conceptualization that is required for gender equity to include trans\*

voices. Finally, I describe the pragmatic concerns related to a re-conceptualization of gender equity within the academia.

### **Uncertainty with Re-Conceptualizing Gender Equity**

Imagining this future new discourse was difficult for many participants, responses to my question about how gender equity would be different with the inclusion of trans faculty voices were marked by pauses and laughter. For example, Joy, a transsexual professor said, “Hmm. Here, I thought I’d heard all of the questions before in some form. Not that one. That’s really interesting. I am just going think out loud.” Joy continued to say, “One thing is there really is just not that many trans people.” Given the highly contested politics of trans identification (e.g., contested inclusion of cross dressers and drag artists) depending on how one defines trans, this could be a relatively small group or a rather large group. The complication that Joy offers to the category of trans is necessary and part of why thinking about trans inclusion within gender equity discourses becomes difficult, who counts as trans\* is a central question for Joy in her hesitation to respond to my question. In the spirit of *academic gender justice*, I argue that exploring the various ways gender-based oppression adversely affects academics is an important task for researchers and institutional leaders alike.

Similar to Joy’s response, Bryce, a gender non-conforming, non-tenure track faculty member, paused and then said, “That’s a good question,” and then paused again. Bryce’s silence may have been prompted by different thoughts than Joy’s. Bryce’s initial silence centered more on what including trans\* faculty voices might mean, rather than which voices could potentially be included. When I asked Kyle, a genderqueer tenured associate professor, about re-conceptualizing gender equity, ze laughed and said, “Right...” and paused for a while. Kyle then connected this question back to previous ones about whether institutional leaders acknowledge the existence of trans\* individuals. In Kyle’s case silence was indicative of the larger erasure of trans\* people in higher education.

These pauses and laughter may be for potentially different reasons, yet, the importance of pausing, silence, and laughter in response to this question are worth noting. As Mazzei (2011) argued about white pre-service teachers and silence, “[silences] are produced in response to the dominant reality of our communities” (p. 664). Within the context of trans\* faculty, there is considerable debate about language, gender socialization, and recognition and visibility (see Valentine, 2007). The dominant reality for trans\* people, including faculty, is the silencing of experiences and erasure of their lives. For at least one participant, the complexities of the dominant reality, and the difficulty of thinking about trans\* inclusion within gender equity discourses, “pulling apart” the pieces was a helpful strategy.

In response to the notion of trans\* inclusive gender equity, Orlando, a transmasculine adjunct professor, said, “I’m trying to pull it apart.” In Orlando’s pulling apart, ze first described issues of gender equity without trans\* individuals being involved. Ze then said that hir institution “did a study on campus and found that it’s [the campus] is not equitable.” After describing the non-equitable campus, Orlando arrived at an important gem, “When I think about gender equity, I think about sexism.” For me, Orlando highlighted that the current discourse of gender equity is primarily undergirded by sexism, an oppressive system that gender equity policies seeks to eliminate, or reduce negative effects.

Orlando continued to say after a long pause, “There’s ways in which gender within [pause] the trans community, and how [the] trans community then intersects with cis[gender] community, and then you add the gender in, that becomes really hard for me to try to sort out.” In the “sorting out” Orlando’s comments demonstrate that the current framing of gender equity does not consider the possibility that there could be trans\* academics. Trying to “plug” trans\* individuals within that discourse requires peeling back many layers of overlapping and mutually reinforcing systems of sex/gender oppression (Butler, 1990).

The uncertainty about what it would mean to include trans\* voices within the current discourse of gender equity likely meant different things for each participant based on their stories,

worldview, and experiences with identity and gender equity. But the silences in interviews were telling. As Mazzei (2007) argued, silence is “*meaning full and purpose full*” (p. 116, emphasis in original). I interpret these silences as a representation of the erasure and silencing of trans\* voices within society and, more specifically, within higher education. Gender equity within the academia, as I described earlier, simply does not include trans\* people, the experiences of trans\* faculty are completely invisible.

In my estimation, what lurks in the silences, pauses, and laughter is precisely this: current institutional and social structures that routinely elide and erase trans\* faculty voices and experiences. Therefore, thinking in a way where trans\* voices were considered, let alone valued, is actually quite difficult. Erasures of trans\* faculty occurs in everyday practices, such as at the faculty senate meeting when the convener says, “welcome, ladies and gentleman,” or when a new employee form asks individuals to check “male” or “female,” or when the “Committee on the Status of Women” never specifies which women to which they are referring. These erasures occur at the level of common, everyday speech and communicative acts, and they likely make it difficult for trans\* faculty to articulate a future vision where their voice is heard and valued. After moving through silences, participants identified two different ways to rethink gender equity. First, participants described theoretical reconceptualization, and, second, pragmatic concerns about operationalizing trans\* inclusive gender equity.

### **Theorizing About (Binary) Gender Equity with Trans\* Faculty Voices**

As participants and I unpacked what it might mean to bring trans\* voices into the conversation about gender equity. I posit that advancing gender justice, and corresponding investments in creating anti-oppressive workplaces, also requires more complex ways of theorizing trans\* experiences, so as to realize the goals of *academic gender justice*. Bryce, a transmasculine non-tenure faculty member, described one aspect that including trans\* perspectives in conversations about gender equity would mean in theorizing gender in more complex ways. Bryce said, “that you’ve got people who were raised in one compartmentalized

box, feeling like the other compartmentalized box, since most people see everything as binary.” For Bryce, trans\* inclusion within gender equity discourses might help scholars and institutional leaders to better understand the potential socially constructed differences between men and women, which are often taken up in essentialized and dichotomized ways (Probert 2005). In some ways, better understanding the socialization that occurs within the two socially compartmentalized gender boxes has the potential to illuminate some of the differences in treatment that occur within academic workplaces, at least from Bryce’s perspective.

Taking up the issue of socialization and extending Bryce’s arguments, Orlando, a genderqueer non-tenured instructor, stated the following:

I do believe that the sex we are assigned at birth and we are raised as, has a lot to do with how we are socialized, in terms of privilege. Then the privilege we are given or lose depending on how we are read, and our gender nonconformity plays a part. Just because I’m not trying to be a man doesn’t mean I don’t get male privilege on the days that I am read as a man, even though that’s not how I identify. If it’s how I’m read—I feel it. I notice it when I’m given it.

Orlando’s key argument in the quote above highlights several key points. Orlando identified as interplaying in determining one’s relationships to sex/gender privilege are sex assigned at birth, gender socialization, and then reading practices that allow or foreclose possibilities. Additionally, Orlando identified gender non-conformity as a mediator in conferring privileges upon individuals. I would add that race- and class-based assumptions also influence reading practices and the privileges afforded or foreclosed through those readings. Ze is complicating systems of privilege and oppression as they operate on an individual basis. Specifically, Orlando stated that even if ze doesn’t identify as a man, ze still receives male privilege based on hir gender presentation. In complicating notions of privilege, as they play out on the individual level, Orlando offers a more complex view of what Bryce began saying about socialization within two gender binary compartments. Taken together, Orlando and Bryce point to the complications that any theorizing

about gender entails, and the ways that thinking about gender equity might be different if, researchers considered trans\* perspectives.

While everyday interactions (e.g., being afforded male privilege) often lead to the larger systemic inequalities observed (e.g., uneven rates of pay), I argue that theorizing *academic gender justice* requires moving away from an individualized view of oppression and towards a systemic view. Ardel, a genderqueer tenured professor, had a different view about the gender binary, they said,

true equity, would be that we didn't even have the [gender] binary sitting there that we have to deal with. I mean true equity would be that whatever gender identity you have is what you have and maybe that is my idealistic, Pollyanna world.

What Ardel argued for was eliminating the gender binary, a socio-cultural system that results in gender-based oppression, primarily as means to end salary differences on the basis of proscribed gender. After my asking what eliminating the binary would do, they said, "I actually think all of it, no pay differences. The work you do is the work you do. Gender identity shouldn't matter in that at all. It is the work that you do and the hours that you put in." I interpret Ardel's comments to mean that the instantiation of the gender binary, and the accompanying cultural and social assumptions about gender, are what lead to inequalities and inequities. Therefore, from Ardel's perspective, if the gender binary no longer existed, then there would be no reasonable basis by which to justify any pay differences.

In moving from the individual to systemic level, I argue that bringing trans\* voices has many benefits (e.g., perspectives of individuals about gender) and potential complications (e.g., understanding the interplay between assigned sex, socialization, and daily interactions). These benefits and complications are important to think through when re-conceptualizing gender equity. Connecting participants' perspectives to the larger conversation about gender equity, underscores the fact that gender equity discourses inadvertently reifies binary (cis)genders and limits what can be known about gendered employment experiences within the academy. Studies, as described

above, examining gender equity often focus on comparing male/men's experiences to female/women's experiences (e.g., Toutkoushian & Conley, 2005). Some trans\* individuals, including Ardel and Jake would like to eliminate the gender binary because this binary is a source of oppression for many individuals, trans and cisgender alike. Jake said, "we obviously can't split gender into a binary," at least in part because doing so brings up "your legal sex." Even if it were feasible to eliminate the gender binary, the notion of doing so, would not honor all trans\* lives, nor advance justice, necessarily. Joy's comments are helpful to elucidate the tension I am describing. She stated:

It was common [at a recent gender-focused conference] to see people wearing "smash the gender binary" t-shirts and things like that. If you're me, you don't want to smash the gender binary. In fact, smashing the gender binary would be smashing a good bit of my identity. However, there are other people who feel like any binary gender identity, including mine, is part of, and reinforces the system of oppression that makes it hard, for example, for them to walk down the street without being harassed, because they're not read as solely human because they can't be read in terms—because their gender signals don't make sense in relation to binary standards.

The same idea that fellow conference goers had about "smashing the gender binary," is also relevant within the context of *academic gender justice* work. If the goal of gender equity is to reduce or eliminate material manifestations of sexism (e.g., pay differences), then a gender justice approach to equity would seek to eliminate all systematic forms of oppression, particularly gender-based oppression, adversely affecting faculty. The difficulty in co-theorizing about gender equity with trans\* faculty is that there are inherent tensions in individual's perspectives.

Eliminating the binary makes Joy's binary gender identity less intelligible and cohesive. Keeping the gender binary is oppressive towards non-binary individuals like Ardel.

To further complicate gender equity, Timothy, a non-tenure track trans man, articulated that re-thinking gender equity requires a more complex understanding oppression. He stated,

“trans is a separate factor of oppression. That all trans lives, whether the person’s binary identified or not, have generally a number of challenges that cisgender people don’t have.” Adding a trans specific “factor of oppression,” like genderism (Bilodeau, 2009), requires a re-thinking about notions of gender equity, particularly as they pertain to trans\* people in the academy. The work of *academic gender justice* must also become more complex in accounting for variety of ways that interlocking systems of oppression shape the experiences of trans\* faculty.

Any understanding of how to eliminate gender-based oppressions necessitates an interrogation of sexism, racism, classism, heterosexism, and ableism. Here, I describe the ways in which racism is especially relevant to any conversation about academic gender justice. Racialized differences often exacerbate gender inequalities (e.g., pay differences), wherein Black and Latina women are often paid less than white and Asian women (Toutkoushian, et al., 2007). Here I am not arguing along a racially essentialized mode of thinking (e.g., being Latina is an inherently “inferior” or that White women occupy an inherently “superior” position), rather, I am arguing along similar lines as Darder and Torres (2004) who stated that, “racism is linked to racialization, a process by which populations are categorized and ranked on the basis of phenotypical traits or cultural signifiers” (p. 13). The racism that manifests within pay differences is part of an “ideological set of practices and discourses embedded in the project of modernity and capitalist expansion” (Darder & Torres, 2004, p. 13). Whether made explicit or not, racialized ideologies, built on notions of inferiority and supremacy, inform the observed inequalities within academe (Darder & Torres, 2004).

Here, I follow Darder and Torres (2004) argument that “it is the *material* domination and exploitation of populations, in the interest of perpetuating a deeply entrenched capitalist system of world domination, which serves as the impetus for the construction of social formations of inequality,” (p. 17) (emphasis in original). In other words, any analysis of the various “-isms” must also examine modernity and capitalism within a globalized social milieu as forces that seek

to exacerbate, and further cement social inequalities. As Kyle stated, “When I think about gender performance, it is rooted in a racial performance as well.” Kyle then connected zir masculine performance with social class and status as an educated person, in saying, “I’ve never donned anything other than what is very much reflective of my social class and educational status first. Then also my race, I think along with that.” Here Kyle gestures towards the ways in which systems of domination layer upon each other and how different performances intersect within zir life and gender performance. The mandate of professionalism is part of the capitalist construction of social inequality described by Darder and Torres (2004).

As I theorize with participants, my contribution to the theoretical re-conceptualization of gender equity is *academic gender justice*. A concept undergirded by a radical re-thinking of the causes and solutions of the oppression experienced by trans\* faculty. If the logics of modernity and capitalism are the social forces that make social inequalities both acceptable, and largely invisible, then I posit that *academic gender justice* and corresponding acts of resistance can be an important antidote to oppression. I describe resistance strategies in more details in a later section.

### **Re-Conceptualizing Gender Equity Pragmatically**

Having just discussed the theoretical concerns related to re-thinking gender equity, there are also pragmatic concerns. By pragmatic, I mean that trans\* faculty articulated practical and logistical concerns regarding gender equity. Here I described data keeping strategies and policy reforms.

In order to better understand *academic gender justice* among all faculty, in a way that honored trans\* people, Nathan, an intersex trans man, tenured faculty member, described some necessary preliminary steps. He said:

Tracking people would be useful so that you’d have that data. Then, recognizing the diversity of gender experiences means recognizing the diversity of gender and sex as well. Intersex people and genderqueer people have to be able to be articulated—within

the system. The binary way of classifying people, both in terms of sex and gender, has to open up and be recognized as not representing everybody.

What Nathan contributes to the pragmatic concerns of *academic gender justice* is that data systems would need to be sensitive enough to account for more than two sexes and genders.

While Nathan described a shift in data systems, Kyle described a similar shift, but applied this idea to both gender and sex categories within policies and data systems.

Kyle described the importance of as beginning with an acknowledgement that trans\* people exist. Ze said:

Pay equity and family leave policies, and all of these things clearly render trans people invisible, right? Trans people are not counted in those. The pay equity is about men versus women. If we're going to talk about pay equity and include trans people, we need to talk about men, women, trans. Which again, brings us back to, "We need to actually account for trans people." We need to actually ask the question and find out how many trans people there are. We actually need to get that data in the first place to even include that.

In accounting for trans\* people, Kyle asserts that we need to account for trans people and offers at least three categories to begin (cisgender) men and women and trans\* people. Later, Kyle elaborated ze's point even more by saying:

because gender is such a central organizing principle [of society, organizations] [...] [There is pressure to] [j]ust be one thing or the other. In the way that—how transgender has been constructed as a concept has been around that [gender binary] assumption. [...] That reinforcement of the binary, even in defining what it means to be transgender becomes exclusive and hegemonic for trans people who don't, like me, who don't exist within that. [...] There's very little language and structure, support structures, that actually support doing that [e.g., having a non-binary gender identity].

Jake argued along similar lines as Kyle, when he said, “Obviously, if we really accepted trans voices and erased that idea, then we’d have to find new ways to start thinking about—even just those issues of pay and parental leave.” Taken together, Jake, Kyle and Nathan described the importance of creating data systems, underwritten by the assumption that trans\* people exists, need to be more sensitive to capturing trans\* faculty experiences. But a data system that simply reified the gender binary and did not show support for multiple possible genders and sexes would be inherent oppressive to Kyle, and Nathan, respectively. Even if institutional leaders added transgender as a category to increase understanding about common metrics of gender equity, like salary, this inclusion must recognize that various ways that trans identities manifest (e.g., binary, non-binary). As Timothy, a non-tenure track trans man stated,

When we include trans folks, we have to recognize that when we talk about gender equity, it’s much more complicated. [...] In terms of categories, one of the things about being trans is that there’s an upsetting of the traditional categories. Then to identify more categories sometimes seems like a fix.

But as sj cautioned:

When we’re talking about gender, we’ve got to also be really mindful that not everybody has a gender and wants a gender. That’s a construct as well. Maybe it’s more about how do we talk about equity amongst different types of identities rather than just move away from gender equity because that’s the most number to begin with.

Taken together, Nathan, Kyle, Timothy, and sj articulated two key pragmatic concerns about data systems: the need for more than two sex and gender boxes and creating spaces for individuals who do not identify with gender at all (e.g., agender).

In addition to expanding gender and sex categories within data systems, forms, and policies, Jesse builds on Timothy’s idea about logics of the traditional categories, including the logic of the family (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012). They said:

If trans identities were included [within gender equity], the best thing that would come out of that would be—I don't even want to use the word "family," but a non-focus on this "man and woman thing with their kids" is what we're going to [use family to] define everything, everything as women get paid less because they have a man to rely on. [...] I feel like trans voices might undermine the idea that it has to be a two person couple [...] Trans voices can undermine the naturalness of [that] sort of pairing because even a gay or a same-sex pairing is based on that idea of male-female. [...] I mean that any disruption, including trans voices, have the potential to disrupt structures that are "couple" based, or family based— which for me as a single parent is one of the hardest things to deal with.

Jesse's comments refer to the ways in which the "traditional" family unit undergirds policies geared towards disrupting gender equity, including family-medical leave and equal pay. Jesse's comments are as much pragmatic as they are theoretical. From Jesse's point of view, institutional leaders cannot write policies with a cisgender, heterosexual family in mind. Measures of gender equity cannot be built on the assumption that a woman has "a man to rely on."

The notion of a "traditional" family follows logics of compulsory heterosexuality (Rich, 1980) and the heterosexual matrix (Butler, 1990). Rich (1980) urged historians (but just as important for education researchers) to, "ask at every point how heterosexuality as institution has been organized and maintained through the female wage scale... the withholding of education from women... and much else (p. 141). Using Rich's (1980) argument to further articulate Jesse's comments, it is clear that the institution of heterosexuality organizes and maintains key indicators of gender equity (e.g., equal pay). Building on this idea some more, Butler (1990) argued that, "the binary restriction on sexuality... constitutes the matrix of intelligibility through which primary bisexuality itself becomes unthinkable" (p. 54). Here Butler is describing the repression of bisexuality in favor of heterosexuality, built on the critique that certain sexed/gendered behaviors, and corresponding sexualities are "natural." In critiquing gendered performances, Butler (1990) argued that the only intelligible sex/genders and sexualities are ones that align

neatly with a heterosexual matrix. Both compulsory heterosexuality and the heterosexual matrix underwrite the assumptions of current policy efforts, including family-medical leave.

### Discussion

By placing the voices of Ardel, Bryce, Timothy, Jesse, Kyle, sj, Joy, Orlando, Jake, and Nathan alongside one another, a more nuanced understanding of the current tensions that the inclusion of trans\* voices within gender equity emerge. I began by describing silences and laughter present within individuals' stories. Each of those silences meant something different. For Joy, silence was about who might be included in the category of "trans." For Kyle, silence was about the lack of recognition that trans lives exist. Orlando tried to pull apart the various moving parts through silence. Each of these silences led me to conclude that current institutional and social structures that routinely elide and erase trans\* faculty voices and experiences, and this often makes it difficult for trans\* faculty to imagine a difference future wherein their lives are taken into account

In revealing the reassurance of trans\* lives, I then addressed theoretical and pragmatic concerns in the reconceptualization of gender equity into what I call *academic gender justice*. Participants and I described theoretical concerns including socialization, the (lack of) utility of the gender binary, unique forms of gender-based oppression, and specifically naming the ways that race influences experiences within the academy. In so doing, I highlight the two important tenets of *academic gender justice*, namely, that trans\* individuals must name the oppression they face (e.g., gender binary as oppressive, though not universally so), and the notion of identities as mutually constitutive of the experiences of trans\* faculty.

In addressing pragmatic concerns, participants and I described university forms and data systems, the logics that undergird policies, the disruption of "traditional categories," and importance of creating policies that do not privilege certain kinds of families. In raising these concerns, I connected participants' experiences with the following tenets of *academic gender justice*: conceptualizing gender as multifaceted, saliency of the heterosexual matrix (Butler,

1990), and the importance of contesting norms and logics as important strategies to improve the livability of trans\* faculty lives (Spade, 2011). By connecting participants voices to the key tenets of *academic gender justice* articulated earlier, I sought to reveal the dramatic ways that the inclusion of trans\* identities within gender equity would disrupt the genderist and heterosexist logics which currently undergird the concept.

### **Conclusion**

Re-conceptualizing gender equity in higher education is a vitally important political project for trans\* academics. Through this study, I sought to develop some preliminary tenets of *academic gender justice* in order to re-conceptualize gender equity from the perspectives of trans\* faculty. To summarize their comments, the discourse gender equity would need to fundamentally re-think the existing logics of sex/gender, families, and oppression. Re-conceptualizing gender equity with trans\* people in mind would mean substantial changes to data collection systems and policies.

I drew attention to the existing logics of the academy that, as Kyle stated earlier, “render trans lives invisible” within the existing discourse of gender equity. By considering the voices and experiences of the trans\* faculty who shared their perspectives through this study, it is clear that, the conversation about gender equity must move beyond conceiving of women as exclusively cisgender, and mostly heterosexual, and presumably childbearing. In keeping with trans\* politics and a gender justice framework, seizing opportunities to resist dominant discourses and hegemonic norms about sex and gender, including those that operate within trans\* communities is vitally important to trans\* faculty (Spade, 2011). Additionally, identifying unique forms of oppression that trans\* faculty face, in an effort to eliminate them, is critically important to advance gender justice within the academy (Young, 2011).

**ARTICLE WC: 7,970**

### References

- American Association of University Professors. (2001). Statement of principles on family responsibilities and academic work. (AAUP Policies and Reports). Retrieved from [http://www.aaup.org/file/Family\\_and\\_Academic\\_Work.pdf](http://www.aaup.org/file/Family_and_Academic_Work.pdf)
- Armenti, C. (2004). Gender as a barrier for women with children in academe. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 34(1), 1–26.
- Bailyn, L. (2003). Academic careers and gender equity: Lessons learned from MIT. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 10(2), 137–153.
- Beemyn, G. (2005). Making campuses more inclusive of transgender students. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, 3(1), 77–87.
- Beemyn, G., & Rankin, S. (2011). *The lives of transgender people*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Beemyn, G., & Rankin, S. (2011). *The lives of transgender people*. Columbia University Press.
- Bender-Baird, K. (2011). *Transgender employment experiences: Gendered perceptions and the law*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Bender-Baird, K. (2011). *Transgender employment experiences: Gendered perceptions and the law*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Bilodeau, B. (2009). *Genderism: Transgender students, binary systems and higher education*. Saarbrücken, Germany: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.

- Bird, S., Litt, J. S., & Wang, Y. (2004). Creating status of women reports: Institutional housekeeping as “women’s work.” *NWSA Journal*, *16*(1), 194–206.
- Budge, S. L., Tebbe, E. N., & Howard, K. A. S. (2010). The work experiences of transgender individuals: Negotiating the transition and career decision-making processes. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *57*(4), 377.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, *19*(5), 2–14. doi:10.2307/117610
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, *1989*, 139–167.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*(6), 1241–1299. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Cress, C. M., & Hart, J. (2009). Playing soccer on the football field: The persistence of gender inequities for women faculty. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *42*(4), 473–488. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10665680903284523>
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

- Dispenza, F., Watson, L. B., Chung, Y. B., & Brack, G. (2012). Experience of career-related Discrimination for female-to-male transgender persons: A Qualitative Study. *The Career Development Quarterly*, *60*(1), 65–81.
- Enke, A. F. (2012). The Education of Little Cis: Cisgender and the Discipline of Opposing Bodies. In A. Enke (Ed.), *Transfeminist Perspectives in and beyond Transgender and Gender Studies* (pp. 60–77). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative* (Vol. xxii). San Francisco, CA, US: Jossey-Bass.
- Gibson, S. K. (2006). Mentoring of women faculty: The role of organizational politics and culture. *Innovative Higher Education*, *31*(1), 63–79.
- Grant, J., Mottet, L., Tanis, J., Harrison, J., Herman, J., & Keisling, M. (2011). *Injustice at every turn: A report of the national transgender discrimination survey*. Washington, DC: National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. Retrieved from [http://www.thetaskforce.org/reports\\_and\\_research/ntds](http://www.thetaskforce.org/reports_and_research/ntds)
- Herek, G. M. (1990). The context of anti-gay violence notes on cultural and psychological heterosexism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *5*(3), 316–333. <http://doi.org/10.1177/088626090005003006>
- Irwin, J. (2002). Discrimination against gay men, lesbians, and transgender people working in education. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, *14*(2), 65–77.

Johnson, G. E., & Stafford, F. P. (1974). The earnings and promotion of women faculty. *The American Economic Review*, 888–903.

Kilson, M. (1976). The status of women in higher education. *Signs*, 1(4), 935–942.

King, J. E. (2006). *Gender equity in higher education: 2006*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Lennon, E., & Mistler, B. J. (2010). Breaking the binary: Providing effective counseling to transgender students in college and university settings. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, 4(3-4), 228–240.

Lester, J. (2011). Regulating gender performances: Power and gender norms in faculty work. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education*, 4(2), 142–169.

Marine, S. B., & Nicolazzo, Z. (2014). Names that matter: Exploring the tensions of campus LGBTQ centers and trans\* inclusion. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 7(4), 265–281. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0037990>

Mason, M. A., & Goulden, M. (2004). Marriage and baby blues: Redefining gender equity in the academy. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 596(1), 86–103.

Mazzei, L. A. (2007). *Inhabited silence in qualitative research: Putting post-structural theory to work* (New York, NY, Peter Lang).

Namaste, V. K. (2000). *Invisible lives: The erasure of transsexual and transgendered people*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Nettles, M. T., & Perna, L. W. (1995). Sex and race differences in faculty salaries, tenure, rank, and productivity: why, on average, do women, African Americans, and Hispanics have lower salaries, tenure, and rank? In *ASHE 1995 Annual Meeting*. Orlando, FL. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED391402>
- Probert, B. (2005). "I just couldn't fit it in": Gender and unequal outcomes in academic careers. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 12(1), 50–72.
- Renn, K. A. (2010). Lgbt and queer research in higher education: The state and status of the field. *Educational Researcher*, 39(2), 132–141.
- Rich, A. (1996). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. In S. Jackson & S. Scott (Eds.), *Feminism and Sexuality: A Reader* (pp. 130–141). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Schilt, K. (2006). Just one of the guys? How transmen make gender visible at work. *Gender and Society*, 20(4), 465–490.
- Sears, J. T. (1997). Thinking critically/intervening effectively about heterosexism and homophobia: A twenty-five-year research retrospective. In J. T. Sears & W. L. Williams (Eds.), *Overcoming Heterosexism and Homophobia: Strategies that Work* (pp. 13–48). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Sensoy, Ö., & DiAngelo, R. J. (2012). *Is everyone really equal?: An introduction to key concepts in social justice education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Serano, J. (2007). *Whipping girl: A transsexual woman on sexism and the scapegoating of femininity* (annotated edition). Emeryville, CA: Seal Press.

- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: markets, state, and higher education*.
- Spade, D. (2011). *Normal life: Administrative violence, critical trans politics and the limits of law*. Brooklyn, NY: South End Press.
- Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: a new approach to culture, structure and process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tompkins, A. (2014). Asterik. *Transgender Studies Quarterly*, 1(1-2), 26–27.
- Toutkoushian, R. K., & Conley, V. M. (2005). Progress for women in academe, yet inequities persist: Evidence from NSOPF: 99. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(1), 1–28.
- Toutkoushian, R. K., Bellas, M. L., & Moore, J. V. (2007). The interaction effects of gender, race, and marital status on faculty salaries. *Journal of Higher Education*, 572–601.
- Umbach, P. D. (2007). Gender equity in the academic labor market: An analysis of academic disciplines. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(2), 169–192.
- Valentine, D. (2007). *Imagining transgender: An ethnography of a category*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2004). Academic motherhood: Managing complex roles in research universities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(2), 233–257.

West, M., & Curtis, J. (2006). *AAUP faculty gender equity indicators*. American Association of University Professors. LOCATION

Young, I. M. (2011). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.